Further, Government in their Order No. E. 2361-404—R. & P. S. 25-48-3, dated 15th June 1951, have ordered that the candidates after entry into service should be put on probation subject to their passing t e departmental tests within a period of 2 years; if such candidates fail to pass the departmental tests within a period of 3 years their services should be terminated. Government in the same order have given 3 years' time to those who were already in service to pass the prescribed tests during which they (officials who were *sub pro tem* or permanent) have been allowed the increments. They have further directed in the same order that the stipulation of special tests to cross Efficiency Bars in the several grades may be done away with. The implication of this apparently is that all the prescribed tests for any particular grade should be passed during the period of probation or 3 years as the case may be. Up to 1st April 1952, acting service of officials who had no substantive appointments under Government did not count for increments and officials who were not made *sub pro tem* in their appointments were not therefore entitled to increments. From 1st April 1952, even the acting service of officials who held no substantive appoi.tment under Government counts for increments and all acting officials have been allowed increments on 1st April 1953, if they had put in one year service. Increments are admissible only up to 15th June 1954, after which only those officials who have passed all the prescribed tests (Efficiency Bar has since been taken away in the case of Clerks—*vide* Government Order dated 15the June1951) would earn increments.

The number of acting officials (without substantive appointment) who are deprived of increments prior to 1st April 1952, is not readily available as particulars have to be obtained from the various Unit Offices. Exemptions are also being granted to officials who are otherwise fit and recommended from passing the departmental tests for earning increments when they are over 45 years of age as per conditions laid down in G. O. No. E. 8523-623—R. & P. S. 3-52-19, dated 22nd September 1952.

(*b*) No instances.

(*c* Yes. There are 23 instances in the districts noted below and they are under correspondence.

District.	*Number of Instances.*
Shimoga ...	9
Mysore ...	8
Kolar ...	6

There were also some cases in Bangalore, Chikmagalur and Mandya Districts. Suitable action is being taken for expediting their disposal.

Private Buses running in Tumkur-Bangalore Road.

Q.—458. Sri B. C. NANJUNDAIYA (Kora).—

Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(*a*) the rules, if there were any, prescribed while taking monopoly of certain routes for running their Road Transport buses;

(*b*) the maximum number of miles that were allowed to be used by private bus owners in these routes;

(*c*) the names of owners who are given permission to run their buses for more than ten miles and for more than fifteen miles in Tumkur-Bangalore Road;

(*d*) the special reason for giving such permission?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) No rules are prescribed. The monopoly scheme was implemented under Government Order No. T. 1926-36—R. T. 28-52-2, dated the 5th September 1952, and as per Government Order No. T. 2384-95—R. T. 28-52-6, dated the 21st October 1952 and it was given effect to from 1st January 1953.

(*b*) Generally not exceeding five miles.

(*c*) Messrs. Gajanana Merchants' Association, Nelamangala.

(*d*) Messrs. Gajanana Merchants' Association has been granted the exemption considering the fact that the

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

net profits of the Association would be set apart for any charitable purpose that Government may think of. The Association, besides, is not working with a profit motive. The exemption has been granted under certain conditions and is purely temporary.

Paddy Seizure by the Amildar, Chintamani, from Patel Reddeppa of Gollapalli.

Q.—668. **Sri M. C. ANJANEYA REDDY** (Chintamani).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether they are aware that Sri B. S. Narayan who was the Amildar of Chintamani Taluk previously entered the house of Patel Reddeppa of Gollapalli, Chilakalanerpu Hobli, Chintamani Taluk, for collecting the paddy at a time when Patel Reddappa was not in the house and took the entire quantity of paddy stocked in the house with the help of his own servants; the number of pallas of paddy so taken;

(*b*) (i) whether the said patel Reddeppa has alleged that a sum of rupees ten thousand kept in his granary has also been removed along with the paddy and has sought for the permission of the Government for launching a case against the Amildar in a competent court of law; (ii) whether they have granted him permission;

(*c*) whether they are aware that a case has been launched against the said Reddeppa by the Amildar; and how that case has been disposed of by the court;

(*d*) whether the pateli post of Reddeppa has been suspended; the reason for so suspending?

A.—**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA** (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) No.

(*b*) (i) Yes.

(ii) No. As Government saw no reason to interfere in the matter.

(*c*) Yes; the case ended in discharge on 3rd November 1952.

(*d*) Yes, for the following reasons :—

(i) Unauthorised cultivation of Government lands.

(ii) Acting against food acquisition work of Government.

(iii) Obstruction to Government Officers on lawful duty.

(iv) Absenting himself unauthorisedly on 13th September 1950.

Park in the Agrahar of Chintamani Town

Q.—670. **Sri M. C. ANJANEYA REDDY** (Chintamani).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the opening ceremony of a park in the Agrahar of Chintamani Town was performed by the Hon'ble Minister Sri T. Channiah, B.Sc., under the auspices of Chintamani Town Municipality a few days ago; the amount spent on the park and whether this amount has been met by the Municipality or paid by Sri Doddapillappa;

(*b*) whether this park is called "Sriman Doddapillappa's Park";

(*c*) whether the land in which the park is situated belongs to the Municipality, or whether it is a survey number; if it is a survey number, whether it has been properly acquired by the Municipality;

(*d*) whether they are aware that the Amildar has put forth a *takrar thakte* pleading that the site is not fit for a park and so cannot be alienated, due to the existence of latrines and manure pits at the southern side emitting always filthy smell?

A.—**Sri T. CHANNIAH** (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(*a*) Yes.

Amount spent on the Park is Rs. 2,192-12-0 and it was spent from the Municipal funds.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The land does not belong to the Municipality and bears S. No. 218 Kharab of Nekkundi Village and that proposals for the alienation of this land